

1961

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

4639

The American Jewish Committee made public today a protest to the National Civil War Centennial Commission for the discriminatory treatment accorded a member of the New Jersey delegation who was unable to secure equal housing, because of racial restrictions, with other delegates at the national assembly of the commission in Charleston, S.C.

The text of the letter, which was issued by Dr. Alan H. Herman, chairman of the American Jewish Committee's Essex County Chapter, is as follows:

"The American Jewish Committee in New Jersey protests the discriminatory treatment accorded a distinguished member of the New Jersey Civil War Centennial Commission who was unable to secure, because of racial restrictions, equal housing with her fellow delegates at the assembly of the National Civil War Centennial Commission to be held in Charleston, S.C.

"In our view, this indignity to an official representative is not only an affront to the sovereign State of New Jersey, but it dramatizes a moral issue for the entire world to note that despite our preachments about democracy, basic human rights, and civil liberties are denied to minority group members within our borders.

"We believe and strongly urge that all public functions under the auspices of our National Government be open to all citizens on an equal basis. We, therefore, call upon the National Civil War Centennial Commission to take immediate steps to rectify this disservice to American interests and make certain that all who attend the national assembly of the commission will be treated with the courtesy and the human dignity which such an historic occasion warrants."

The American Jewish Committee, founded in 1906, is the pioneer human relations agency in this country, combating bigotry, protecting civil rights and advancing inter-group and interreligious understanding. Its national headquarters is the new Institute of Human Relations which serves as a center of research, education, and action in the field of human relations.

IMPORTATION OF MEXICAN NATIONALS

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ST. GERMAIN) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include extraneous matter.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, in a period of high unemployment and increasing economic distress, there are a great many questions which have yet to be answered in regard to the continuation of the program of importing Mexican nationals to work on American farms. Public Law 78, which was necessary and desirable when first enacted, has come to be less of a contribution and more of a detriment to the economic health of the Nation with each passing year. Of so it would seem.

The Committee on Agriculture has been holding hearings on the extension of Public Law 78. Oregon's distinguished labor commissioner, the Honorable Norman O. Nilsen, has become nationally recognized as an outstanding authority in the general field of migratory agricultural labor conditions. I believe that Commissioner Nilsen's statement to the committee, submitted for the present hearings, is an informative and valuable comment on this subject. I ask that that statement be printed at the conclu-

sion of these remarks, in the Appendix of the Record:

STATE OF OREGON,
BUREAU OF LABOR,
March 17, 1961.

Hon. E. C. GATHINGS,
Chairman, Subcommittee on Equipment,
Supplies, and Manpower, Committee on
Agriculture, House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. GATHINGS: I would greatly appreciate having this statement included in the record of hearings on H.R. 3610 before your committee on extension of Public Law 78.

Having conducted extensive surveys in the State of Oregon in the past several years, the Oregon Bureau of Labor has assembled substantial information depicting the serious economic handicaps of American farmworkers. It is our well-documented view that the only solution is to stimulate better wages and conditions for migrant labor. If this is not done, it is my opinion that it will be the growers who will in the long run suffer, because improvement is bound to come. If a steady improvement is not encouraged by all persons involved I sincerely believe there will be a drastic change by which agriculture will be hurt.

Because of my observations I must obviously be of the opinion that any governmental measures which tend to perpetuate repression and tend to defeat the normal working of the labor market in a situation of labor shortage must, for the benefit of the whole economy, be avoided. Since the availability of foreign workers cannot help but have this effect, I believe that you would not be doing a favor for agriculture if you enacted an extension of Public Law 78 without taking definite steps to bring the program to an end at a time definite in the near future. In my view the only legitimate purpose for an extension would be to reduce the extension of temporary dislocation which might result. In the meantime I urge that Public Law 78 guarantee much greater protection for our domestic workers than it has in the past. I believe that the report of the consultants to the Secretary of Labor in 1959 is the best source of intelligently considered and fair proposals to afford American farmworkers the increased protection, which they need so badly.

There are many groups and individuals, including many in agriculture in Oregon, who concur in my views. We know in Oregon that transition from foreign workers to domestic workers is possible. It has meant increased wages and improved conditions for farmworkers in Oregon and we now import only 300 or 400 Mexican nationals. The work formerly done by Mexican nationals is now done by domestic workers attracted by improved incentives offered by Oregon agriculture. Furthermore, there is no need for the 300 or 400 that we do import and improved protection for domestic workers in Public Law 78 would result in encouraging Oregon pear growers to abandon their crutch and walk quite well without the assistance they pretend to need. Their solution along with vigorous recruiting lies in providing adequate family type housing and other improved conditions.

Sincerely,

NORMAN O. NILSEN,
Oregon Commissioner of Labor.

THE JOHN BIRCH SOCIETY

(Mrs. GREEN of Oregon (at the request of Mr. ST. GERMAIN) was given permission to extend her remarks at this point in the Record and to include an article.)

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, several days ago, a distinguished and

impeccably conservative Member of the other body inserted some materials in the Record in regard to the John Birch Society, an organization which, in the name of "anti-Communism," is conducting a vicious and well-organized campaign calling, among other things, for the impeachment of Chief Justice Warren. Many outstanding Americans, of varying political persuasions, have expressed concern at the tactics, the organizational structure, and the real aims of this organization.

On March 30 there appeared, in the Washington Post, an article about the John Birch Society, setting forth some of the concerns as this group utilizes the language of "un-American" for objectives, which, to say the least, might bear closer American public scrutiny. I ask unanimous consent that this article be printed at this point in the Record.

(By James E. Clayton)

Three months ago, the John Birch Society had been heard of only in a few scattered areas of the country. Its desire to operate quietly and behind the scenes was generally being fulfilled.

But almost overnight, the society has become an organization of national interest. Newspapers on both coasts have denounced it. Two U.S. Senators have spoken against it on the Senate floor. Former Vice President Nixon has joined the protests. Time magazine has given the society a critical analysis.

The society has attracted this attention because of:

Its strong views on many topics. It thinks that everything from increased spending for defense to Federal aid to education is part of a Communist plot.

The attacks made by its leader, Robert Welch, on the loyalty of America's leaders. These include former President Eisenhower, Chief Justice Warren, former Secretary of State Dulles and CIA Director Allen Dulles, all of whom Welch says are Communist agents or sympathizers.

The secrecy which surrounds the society and the amount of money which it apparently has to spend.

CONSERVATIVE COMPLAINTS

Two weeks ago, the Los Angeles Times, a conservative newspaper, said editorially: "If the John Birchers follow the program of their leader, they will bring our institutions into question exactly as the Communists try to do. They will sow distrust, and aggravate disputes, and they will weaken the very strong case for conservatism."

The same day, the Reverend Dr. Eugene Carson Blake, chief executive officer of the United Presbyterian Church in the United States, told a church group in Santa Barbara that the society was waging a "campaign of falsehoods" against that church.

On March 6, on the Senate floor, Senator MURROW J. YOUNG, Republican of North Dakota, said, "It is unbelievable that any sane person would make such accusations" (as the society's leader has made against former President Eisenhower).

Other Senators have also expressed concern about the power of the society. Senator YOUNG, a conservative Republican, says he has been attacked as being a helper of the Communists. The same attack has been mounted against Senator MIKE MANSFIELD, a liberal Democrat from Montana, and Senator THOMAS C. KUCH, a liberal Republican from California. The attack against KUCH and YOUNG has been particularly vigorous, apparently because they are up for reelection in 1962.

But not a great deal is known here about the society. It has not been particularly